



\$~5

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C. 3448/2024**

ANRANYA YADAV & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: **Mr. K.P. Yadav & Mr. Rohit Gupta,**
Advs. with petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: **Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for the State.**
SI Rupa, P.S. G.T.B. Enclave.
Mr. K.P.S. Yadav, Adv. for
R-2/complainant
R-2 through VC

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER
27.05.2024

%

1. The present petition filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of the FIR No. 008/2021, under Sections 354/354A/506 of the IPC, registered at P.S. GTB Enclave and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Saloni Singh, Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that petitioner no.2 is the sister-in-law of respondent no.2/the complainant and petitioner no.1 is the brother of petitioner no. 2. That the Father of petitioners, at PS- Muradnagar, Dist- Ghaziabad, UP, police lodged an FIR



no. 795/2020 under Sections 498A/354/354A/506/323 of the IPC and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act on account of matrimonial dispute between petitioner no.2 and her family members including the present respondent no.2/the complainant. The matter has been settled *vide* Compromise Deed dated 04.05.2023 before Mediation Centre, Ghaziabad. In pursuance of the aforesaid settlement, respondent no.2 has no objection if the present FIR and the consequential chargesheet is quashed.

3. Petitioners are present before the Court and respondent no.2/the complainant is present through video conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective counsel, as well as the Investigating Officer, SI Rupa, P.S. G.T.B. Enclave.

4. The complainant/respondent No.2 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioners and she has no objection if the FIR is quashed. She further states that all the terms of the agreement have been complied with.

5. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned APP for the State also has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

6. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”



7. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 008/2021, under Sections 354/354A/506 of the IPC, registered at P.S. GTB Enclave and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Saloni Singh, Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.
8. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 008/2021, under Sections 354/354A/506 of the IPC, registered at P.S. GTB Enclave and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Saloni Singh, Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, is hereby quashed.
9. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.
10. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 27, 2024/nk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any